DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 363 959 EA 025 444

AUTHOR Porter, Andrew; Osthoff, Eric
TITLE External Strategies for Stimulating and Supporting School Restructuring.
INSTITUTION Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, Madison, WI.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 2 Dec 93
CONTRACT R117Q00005-93
NOTE 63p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Role; *Change Strategies; *Educational Change; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Government; School Business Relationship; *School Restructuring; State Action; State Agencies; State Programs

ABSTRACT

This paper examines how school restructuring can be promoted by agencies outside the school. The first part posits a framework for designing and analyzing external strategies to promote school restructuring. This framework distinguishes between strategies that are: (1) intended to initiate versus support school restructuring; (2) comprehensive versus focused; and (3) sustained versus episodic. Strategies are also distinguished according to their consistency, prescriptiveness, authority, and power. The next part provides an overview of current strategies and situates each strategy within the framework. It describes a range of available strategies for several different types of agencies: federal, state, and district agencies; national organizations; the courts; independent developers; businesses; and teacher unions. The analysis concludes that serious gaps and some contradictions exist among the strategies. Although two promising strategies are identified--the work of professional organizations in creating a general press for reform and in creating a vision--a national strategy for promoting school restructuring is absent. Without a national strategy, the multiple strategies taken simultaneously by many different agencies are not likely to add up to a comprehensive and coherent plan. (LMI)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 363 959

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

# EXTERNAL STRATEGIES FOR STIMULATING AND SUPPORTING SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING

Andrew Porter and Eric Osthoff
University of Wisconsin-Madison

December 2, 1993

**FINAL DELIVERABLE TO OERI**

This paper was prepared at the Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, supported by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (Grant No. R117Q00005-93) and by the Wisconsin Center for Education Research, School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison. In developing the manuscript, helpful suggestions were received from Linda Alford, Jane David, and Fred Newmann. The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the supporting agencies.

EA 025 414



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**External Strategies for Stimulating and Supporting School Restructuring**

Andrew Porter and Eric Osthoff
University of Wisconsin-Madison

At least since 1983 and the publication of *A Nation At Risk*, there has been intense interest in improving the quality of K-12 education in the United States. In the decade that has followed, report after report has reiterated the boldly stated claim: America's students are failing because America's schools are failing. Citing a long list of statistics comparing the achievement of students in 1983 to the achievement of students at other times and in other countries, the authors of *A Nation At Risk* concluded: "The educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and a people" (p. 5).

*A Nation At Risk*'s recommendations were largely standard setting: more academic coursework for high school graduation, higher admission requirements for entrance to college, higher standards for teacher certification. Three years later, raising standards was seen as an insufficient strategy. The Education Commission of the States' report of the Task Force on Education for Economic Growth (1986), Carnegie's *A Nation Prepared* report on teaching (1986), and the National Governors' Association's report *Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education* (1986), all suggested that fundamental change in the ways of schooling would be necessary. Incremental change and fine tuning would not be enough; schools needed to be restructured to meet the higher standards.

A great deal of activity has taken place under the banner of school restructuring. The list of organizations and agencies involved is long, and the strategies employed are many and varied. The focus here, however, is not on school restructuring per se, but rather on how school restructuring can be promoted by agencies outside the school. First, we posit a framework for designing and analyzing external strategies to promote school restructuring. Next, we provide an overview of current

strategies and situate each strategy in our framework. Our analysis leads us to conclude that serious gaps exist among strategies and that there are some damaging contradictions as well. Our intention is to contribute to a national conversation among policy analysts, policymakers, and administrators about how agencies external to the school can best proceed in supporting school restructuring.[1]

In describing the range of possible strategies for promoting school restructuring, several difficulties must be addressed. First, the definition of school restructuring is problematic. Just how broadly or how narrowly defined is the term? Obviously, an analysis of strategies to promote school restructuring requires knowing what school restructuring includes. Second, how wide a net should be cast in describing strategies? Should all potential external influences on school restructuring be considered, or is there a meaningful subset of influences that concentrates on intentions? After dealing with these two basic difficulties, yet a third remains. The list of strategies and sources for stimulating and nurturing school restructuring is endless. Efforts to restructure schools come from the federal government, state governments, and school districts. Beyond the formal school hierarchy, there are professional organizations with general interests (e.g., the National Governors' Association and the Education Commission of the States) and professional organizations with focused interests (e.g., National Council of Teachers of Mathematics and the American Association for the Advancement of Science). Whole new organizations have been created within the school restructuring movement (e.g., New American Schools Development Corporation and the New Standards Project). An exhaustive list of specific efforts to stimulate school restructuring would serve little purpose. What is needed is a structure for thinking analytically about possible strategies.

---

[1]This is the first of several papers to be written on external influences on school restructuring. Subsequent papers will draw from data collected on a sample of 8 elementary, 8 middle, and 8 secondary restructured schools. That sample of schools will be used to document the effects of various strategies to stimulate and nurture school restructuring and to document the effects of various approaches to school restructuring.

That each type of agency can employ any one or several different strategies for stimulating school restructuring presents yet a fourth difficulty. To understand the sources of school restructuring initiatives, it is necessary to know both the types of agencies and the types of strategies each might use. Some strategies may be more appropriate for some types of agencies than others. We have chosen to describe attempts to support school restructuring first by type of agency and, for each agency, the strategies available.

## What Is School Restructuring?

There is no precise and universally agreed on definition of school restructuring (Murphy, 1991). Some advocates of school restructuring focus on the need for schools to pursue ambitious outcomes for all students (David, 1990). Other restructuring advocates focus on changing school processes and school governance (Lieberman & Miller, 1990; Lewis, 1989). Some seek to restructure the whole school system from the federal level, through state and district levels, down into the schools (Elmore, 1990).

Regardless of the definition held for school restructuring, considerable attention is given to changing school and classroom procedures. Changes in approaches to instruction include multidisciplinary courses, cooperative learning groups, cohorts of teachers and students that stay together over years, portfolio assessment, the elimination of tracking and pullout programs, the elimination of grade levels in elementary school, multihour blocks for instructional time. Commonly mentioned organizational changes include extra planning time for teachers, team teaching, site-based management, decision-making councils involving teachers and parents, and business- and/or university-school partnerships.

The Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools' (CORS) conceptual framework focuses on four basic "arenas" for school restructuring: student experiences; professional life of

teachers; school leadership, management, and governance; and coordination of community resources. What makes the CORS conceptual framework unique is the inclusion of six intended outcomes: authentic student achievement; equity; empowerment of parents, teachers, principals, and students; communities of learning; reflective dialogue; and accountability (Newmann, 1993).

CORS produced a list of 38 criteria nested within the four arenas for school restructuring (Newmann, 1993). Each criterion takes the form of a question that directs attention to concrete measures schools might utilize to alter practice. The CORS formulation recognizes that no individual school is likely to satisfy a majority of the 38 criteria and that schools may restructure more intensively or thoroughly in one arena than another.

From the CORS definition of school restructuring, it is clear that standards for both breadth and depth of restructuring are necessary. The breadth standard requires that a restructured school change many aspects of its schooling. Various aspects of restructuring are hypothesized to be interdependent, although no formal model of these interdependencies has been offered. For example, some hypothesize that student experiences cannot be changed without simultaneously changing aspects of leadership, management, and governance. The depth standard requires fundamental change, not just fine tuning.

Unfortunately, breadth and depth are relative terms. What constitutes comprehensive fundamental change to one person may represent a minor variation on traditional schooling to another. This source of ambiguity is illustrated by the results of a CORS search to identify outstanding examples of restructured schools (Berends & King, 1993). In Fall 1991, nominations for restructured schools were sought from 6,000 people and organizations. Based on CORS criteria, 212 schools were nominated. Seventy-five percent of the nominated schools participated in followup interviews from which researchers concluded that substantially fewer of the restructuring criteria were met than originally reported. The most promising examples of restructured schools were visited,

leading researchers to conclude that yet even fewer of the restructuring criteria were satisfied. Finding good examples of restructured schools has not been easy using the CORS interpretation of their conceptual framework.

Deciding what to include under school restructuring interacts with deciding what to include under strategies for promoting school restructuring in yet another way. In the words of Cohen (1988),

> Improving educational productivity requires a restructuring of the entire education system and not just the schools. The structure and process of governance and control at the state and local levels must be adjusted in order to accommodate and support necessary changes in the organization and management of instruction in schools and classrooms. (p. 8)

While systemic reform at the state and district levels qualifies as restructuring education, here we treat it as yet another strategy for promoting school restructuring (Smith & O'Day, 1991).

A restructured school is a unique school. There is no single standard for restructuring against which all schools can be judged; typically there is no definable program to be implemented. The implications for those who seek to promote school restructuring are two-fold. First, school restructuring places a great demand on local school capacity and leadership. Second, because there are multiple and vague definitions of school restructuring, clearcut goals are often lacking. When a state sets out to restructure schools, is the goal to change every school and, in each school, to change the instructional practices of all teachers? Such a demanding goal might be impossible to meet. In contrast, independent developers seek to work with just a handful of schools (and sometimes just a fraction of teachers in each). Against these modest goals, success is more certain. Tensions between specificity and latitude in approaches to restructuring and between ambitious and modest goals for what is to be accomplished are inherent to school reform in the 1980s and 1990s.

## What to Include Under Strategies for Influencing School Restructuring

The possible strategies for promoting school restructuring are many and varied. At this point, they form an unstructured list. The lack of structure makes it impossible to know when the list is complete; from a design perspective, the lack of a structure makes it difficult to know what to include in a mix of strategies to ensure success. Promoting school restructuring can be as idiosyncratic and focused as the efforts of an individual charismatic leader in a school district who advocates site-based management or as remote and bureaucratic as a new state assessment that emphasizes conceptual understanding and application.

### Strategies to Initiate Versus Strategies to Support

We distinguish between strategies that seek to initiate change and those that seek to support an already initiated change. A district might want teachers to use more authentic assessments as a part of their instructional repertoire. Strategies to initiate this change might include using authentic assessment in district testing and requiring that examples of authentic assessment be included in lesson plans. To support this change, the district might provide staff development for teachers to learn authentic assessment techniques and provide teacher release time so that teachers can collaborate on designing instructionally embedded authentic assessments. The latter of these two examples illustrates how one piece of school restructuring (e.g., teacher release time) can be used as a strategy for supporting another piece of school restructuring (e.g., teachers' use of authentic assessments).

Among strategies to support school restructuring are those that seek to remove constraints. A state might want to change curriculum and instruction so that academic disciplines are better integrated. The state might view its minimum competency testing program with results used to make decisions about grade-to-grade promotion as a constraint to subject matter integration; the testing program might be eliminated. Constraints are often thought of as non-negotiable givens. The high

rate of student mobility in an urban school is a constraint to having students and teachers stay together in a cohort over years. Some might argue that student mobility can be decreased through creating magnet schools. Some might even argue that placing a greater emphasis on active student learning and problem solving would so engage students that they would make every effort to stay at the same school. Still, student mobility is a constraint not easily removed. Here we restrict consideration to the strategies of removing constraints created by the formal school hierarchy itself. Constraints arising from the community the school serves are seen as barriers to overcome rather than constraints to be removed.

Comprehensive Strategies Versus Focused Strategies

We distinguish between strategies that are comprehensive in that they address both the breadth and depth of school restructuring and strategies that are focused addressing, for example, only one piece of school restructuring. Changing the mathematics curriculum by itself might not be considered school restructuring. Nevertheless, changing the mathematics curriculum would undoubtedly count as a piece of restructuring in a comprehensive school restructuring effort. Following this line of reasoning, the NCTM *Curriculum Standards* are seen as a strategy for promoting school restructuring.

Sustained Strategies Versus Episodic Strategies

Strategies to initiate and support school restructuring may be episodic, consisting of a single event or report with no history and no planned future, or strategies may have a design over time. Strategies that are intended to initiate school restructuring could logically consist of a single point in time. Strategies to support school restructuring are more logically sustained; ongoing support is obviously needed if schools are to accomplish comprehensive and fundamental change.

Reports from commissions and task forces tend to fit the episodic side of our distinction. *A Nation At Risk* is an excellent example of an episodic strategy which has had a tremendous and continuing influence. In contrast, the National Governors' Association has made a long-term commitment to school restructuring. As a result, the NGA has produced an integrated series of reports that, collectively, form a sustained strategy for initiating school restructuring. In contrast, staff development, a supporting strategy, would seem logically to require a long-term commitment. In fact, however, we find just the opposite. Most staff development is episodic and fragmented rather than sustained and programmatic.

Attributes for Increasing a Strategy's Weight

To our distinctions between initiating versus supporting, comprehensive versus focused, and sustained versus episodic, we add four attributes for increasing a strategy's probable influence (Porter et al., 1988). *Consistency* describes the extent to which all parts of a strategy are mutually reinforcing when judged against their intended effects. If the restructuring goal is greater frequency of learning tasks requiring depth of student understanding (rather than broad exposure), are the district's curriculum frameworks, assessments, and textbook selections all aligned with this goal? *Prescriptiveness* describes the extent to which a strategy specifies the exact nature of the desired restructuring. A district mandate that every school have site-based decision-making gains prescriptiveness to the extent the mandate also specifies the composition of decision-making bodies and the types of decisions to be included. A strategy for promoting school restructuring has *power* to the extent that rewards and sanctions are attached to school responses. Strategies gain *authority* through law (e.g., being a requirement of the formal school hierarchy), expertise (e.g., the extent to which the strategy and/or the type of restructuring being promoted was developed and/or endorsed by recognized education experts), social norms (e.g., the extent to which the strategy "its within

traditions and experience), and support from charismatic individuals. Authoritative strategies persuade individuals that what is desired is appropriate. Powerful strategies, with their rewards and sanctions, seek to force individuals to undertake change, regardless of their beliefs and predilections.

Collectively, these four attributes provide a framework for hypothesizing about the likely effects of various strategies to promote school restructuring. The more consistent, authoritative, and powerful a strategy, the more likely the strategy is to have its intended effect upon school change. As will be seen, prescriptiveness is problematic in that an approach can suffer from either too much or too little prescriptiveness.

## What We Exclude

Just as school restructuring requires comprehensive fundamental change in school practices, promoting school restructuring requires a mix of strategies that collectively address all of the pieces of the restructuring effort. The entire school change literature becomes relevant to the question of what the strategies are for promoting school restructuring (Fullan, 1991). For example, the literature on curriculum reform is relevant to deciding on strategies for promoting school restructuring (Fuhrman & Malen, 1991), as is the literature on good teaching (Porter & Brophy, 1988).

Since most desired changes in education at this time can be thought of as potential pieces of school restructuring, the question of strategies for stimulating and supporting school restructuring could quickly dissolve into a question of strategies for promoting education change. The boundaries between what to include and what to not include are fuzzy. We do not include strategies for stimulating and promoting school change that fail to seek fundamental change in at least one aspect of schooling. Thus, we do not include strategies to promote basic skills instruction, since basic skills instruction is the norm of current day practice, and since the goal of school restructuring is to produce ambitious student achievement outcomes for all students. Neither do we include the many

excellent programs focused on changing teaching practices, such as Cognitively Guided Instruction (Fennema & Carpenter, 1989) or Reciprocal Teaching (Palincsar & Brown, 1984), unless those programs have been adopted by a state or professional organization as a part of a comprehensive and systematic strategy for school change. Many of these programs could be beneficial to a school seeking to restructure, but we see them as resources to be drawn upon, not strategies for initiating or supporting the restructuring of schools. Finally, we do not include strategies for removing constraints presented by the students and community a school serves. This decision is somewhat arbitrary and does exclude from our analysis health and nutrition programs, community transportation and safety programs, as well as preschool and after school programs. Such efforts can be important to school restructuring, but they tend to operate quite independently of K-12 schools.

## Dilemmas in Promoting School Restructuring

Those agencies and individuals investing themselves in the school restructuring movement face a number of dilemmas in deciding how to proceed. These dilemmas provide an important perspective for making sense of the various strategies for promoting school restructuring.

Is one school at a time the best approach to restructuring, or should the strategy attempt to reach all schools simultaneously? (For restructuring student experiences, the dilemma may be whether to restructure one teacher at a time or attempt to reach all teachers simultaneously.) The dilemma is yet another variation on the familiar tension between depth and breadth. Several arguments can be made for the one-school-at-a-time approach. First, each school is distinct in a variety of important ways: the student body to be served, the community in which the school is embedded, the beliefs and capabilities of the staff. For a school to be the best that it can be, the school will need to develop its own unique approach. Second, school restructuring is not a particular approach but rather a call for comprehensive fundamental change within broad parameters. Clearly,

the problem is not one of program implementation with a focus on program integrity across school sites. Third, the enormous challenge of restructuring a school suggests that each school requires a focused and sustained effort if success is to be achieved. On the other hand, a one-school-at-a-time approach may be too limited in the number of schools reached. There are over 100,000 schools in the United States; over 80,000 are public schools. Thus, some strategies for promoting school restructuring seek to reach many schools simultaneously. A good example is Kentucky's multifaceted restructuring package. Obviously, strategies that attempt to reach many schools simultaneously have an especially heavy reliance on school-level initiative and capacity for interpretation and implementation.

Both approaches have their strengths and weaknesses, and each has its advocates. Neither approach ensures success in restructuring all schools. The one-school-at-a-time approach is more likely to be successful in each attempt but suffers from few attempts. The all-schools-simultaneously approach is likely too thin to work with the majority of schools but may still result in stimulating restructuring in a number of schools.

A second dilemma is whether to use mandates or to provide general guidance and emphasize local school empowerment (Porter, 1989). For those who believe they know specific things that schools should be doing, prescriptive mandates seem the most direct and face-valid approach. Some argue that without mandates most schools will never change. But for those who find mandates attractive, problems remain (Clune, 1993). One problem is how to avoid having mandates get in the way of the few schools that are already anxious to change and that, with support and encouragement, might reach a level of excellence in school restructuring that no mandate could envision. Another problem is how to inspire schools to go beyond minimum compliance. Alternatively, for those who favor broad guidance and local school empowerment, the problem is what to do about schools that completely ignore the restructuring movement.

Yet a third dilemma is choosing between principles and prescriptions. Accelerated Schools are an example of using principles (Levin, 1988). The Accelerated Schools strategy provides guidance in each of nine core areas (e.g., school-based governance, pupil assessment). In Levin's words, "The principles set out for the accelerated school are relatively broad ones that can be designed and implemented in a variety of ways" (p. 24). In contrast, prescriptions are detailed and directive. California's Math A, an innovative bridge course for students not yet ready for high school algebra, is defined by a fairly complete 13-unit syllabus. Obviously, the distinction between principles and prescriptions represents a continuum. The dilemma is how to be specific enough to create a useful vision while not being so specific as to stifle creativity. The education change literature has documented the need for local adaptation for successful implementation (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978), suggesting a strategy can be too prescriptive. But strategies that use only general principles may be misinterpreted at the local level.

A fourth dilemma concerns locus of control for identifying the type of restructuring to be undertaken. Should control for specifying the nature of school change be primarily at the school level, limiting the role of external influences to providing support and removing constraints, or should control for specifying the nature of change lie primarily beyond the individual school, for example in the hands of the formal school hierarchy? To the extent that external strategies are prescriptive and rely on power for their influence, the locus of control for school restructuring lies outside the school. To the extent that external strategies are vague about the types of restructuring desired and rely on authority for their influence, the locus of control for restructuring lies with the school. Obviously, there is a continuum between these extremes. Clearly, schools cannot restructure without leadership, initiative, and investment of resources, including time and expertise at the school level. But, just as clearly the idea of school restructuring has not "bubbled up" from individual schools across the nation. A restructuring school must draw expertise and advice from a variety of sources beyond its

walls; some schools might never undertake restructuring without an external prod. As will be seen, strategies for promoting school restructuring differ markedly in assumptions about internal versus external locus of control.

A fifth dilemma concerns time. Change comes slowly; a restructuring school must be given time to make fundamental change. Yet, if change comes too slowly, interest and enthusiasm may wane and political support may evaporate. The dilemma is how to design a strategy for school restructuring that holds promise for showing early successes, while still keeping commitment high over the long haul.

The immediacy of the school restructuring movement creates a sixth dilemma. The problems of education are so vivid that immediate action seems demanded. Further, as school restructuring has become a movement, social and political pressure on educators to act now has mounted. But action is being called for in the face of a highly uncertain technology. In the press to act now, many decisions must be based on educated guesses. If we act now, we don't know what to do; if we wait, it will be too late.

## Strategies and Sources of Leadership

In what follows, each of the several different types of agencies interested in promoting restructuring are considered, and, for each type of agency, a range of available strategies are described. No attempt is made to provide a comprehensive and detailed history of the thousands of efforts to promote school restructuring. Rather, examples are drawn on selectively to illustrate strategies. We start with federal, state, and district agencies. Beyond the education hierarchy, we consider national organizations (Peterson & Bixby, 1992), the courts, independent developers, businesses, and unions.

Presenting strategies for promoting school restructuring by type of agency facilitates consideration of coherence and consistency of approach. In the case of states, for example, we look at statewide systemic designs to promote school restructuring. Consistency and coherence of approach is also a question to be asked at the national level. No mechanism exists for coordinating across agencies strategies to initiate and support school restructuring. Staff development provides a good example of the need for better coordination of strategies for supporting school restructuring. Within a restructuring school, staff members participate in a variety of programs, typically independently and largely at their own initiative, drawing from the smorgasbord of offerings from universities, school districts, independent developers, and professional organizations. But staff development must make sense at the level of an individual school. We do not find this to be the case. There also are examples of confusing, if not potentially contradictory, initiatives. On October 26, 1993, the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences published *Benchmarks for Science Literacy*. At the same time, the National Research Council arm of the National Academy of Sciences is working to develop science standards (using U.S. Department of Education support) due to be released in February 1994. Are both benchmarks and standards needed? Will they be mutually reinforcing? Or will the fact that both exist simply confuse and further dissipate energy?

Federal Strategies

There are a number of agencies within the federal government that have a stake in school restructuring. First among them is the U.S. Department of Education, with its Office of Educational Research and Improvement and its many federal programs in compensatory education, special education, and student aid. The National Science Foundation, especially in its Directorate for Education and Human Resources, has a significant budget for research, development, and demonstration in science and mathematics education. The Department of Labor concerns itself with

connections between K-12 education and the world of work, and the Department of Health and Human Services has a variety of programs for research and development and to provide services to improve the readiness of students for schooling.

*Creating a General Press for School Restructuring*

One of the greatest obstacles to fundamental change in K-12 education is acceptance of the need to change. At one level teachers and the public believe schools need to change to improve, yet teachers tend to believe their own practice is acceptable, and parents tend to believe that the school their children attend is good (Elam, Rose, & Gallup, 1992). Comprehensive fundamental change requires a major commitment on the part of educators, parents, and the public at large. Much more so than in past education reforms, those who wish to promote school restructuring have recognized the need for explicit strategies to convince all relevant parties that change is needed.

There are a number of characteristics of *A Nation At Risk* worth highlighting as exemplars of the strategy of creating a general press. First, the report is short, to the point, and written for a general audience. Second, the language of the report is carefully crafted to inspire. Third, the report was promoted through a professionally orchestrated national publicity campaign. Secretary Bell convened meetings around the country, culminating in Indianapolis with a grand finale attended by President Reagan. Thousands upon thousands of copies of the report were provided to influentials, both inside and outside the education system. The report was based on education research to a much greater extent than had been typical of highly visible education reform documents in the past. The 40 papers commissioned from a wide variety of education scholars provided a great deal of the grist for the conclusions and recommendations of the report. Not only was *A Nation At Risk* influential in its own right, but *A Nation At Risk* has served as a model for countless reports since.

The National Education Goals provide another federal example of the creating-a-press strategy. The President of the United States has rarely been directly and personally involved in education reform; of those rare times, the National Educational Goals are the best example. As with *A Nation At Risk*, the goals do not specifically call for school restructuring, but they do preview several major themes included in most definitions of school restructuring. Goal 3 calls for *all* students mastering challenging subject matter in English, mathematics, science, history, and geography and for all students to learn to use their minds well. Goal 6 calls for schools free of drugs and violence, and Goal 1 calls for all children starting school ready to learn. These goals have stimulated schools to restructure learning environments and to better coordinate with community resources. The National Education Goals are the cornerstone of a number of subsequent federal initiatives, all of which fit the strategy of creating a general press for school restructuring (e.g., the National Education Goals Panel).

Education research is a third example of the federal government's strategy for creating a general press for school restructuring. The National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP), begun in 1970, has come to be called the Nation's Report Card. NAEP assessments of student achievement in core academic areas, based on national probability samples of students at ages 9, 13, and 17, have provided the best source of data for monitoring the outputs of schooling at the national level (Mullis, Owen, & Phillips, 1990). NAEP data are universally cited in arguments that schools must be improved. Similarly, federally supported U.S. participation in international comparisons of academic achievement has uncovered our nation's relatively weak standing among the world's developed countries. These international comparisons were especially influential with the National Commission on Excellence in Education. The results of international comparisons are now routinely reported by the National Center for Education Statistics in its publication on *The Condition of Education* (1993).

*Creating A Vision*

Another federal strategy for promoting school restructuring is to participate in creating a vision. The best example to date is America 2000 announced by President George Bush in 1991. In the words of then-Secretary of Education Lamar Alexander, America 2000 "is a bold, comprehensive, and long-range plan to move every community in America toward the National Education Goals" (p. 1). While America 2000 was a federal initiative, it was not a federal program. Within America 2000, the federal role was limited to setting standards, providing funds, and generally being one source of leadership for change. The initial description of America 2000 (1991) consisted of only 62 pages, but was nevertheless specific in articulating a four-part approach, with goals and strategies under each. Throughout the document, commitment to school restructuring was clear, calling "for tomorrow's students: a new generation of American schools" (p. 19). America 2000 includes the idea for a New American Schools Development Corporation to support research and development to create models of restructured schools. America 2000 communities across the country were to create "new American schools" with modest federal support. While federal funding was never provided, communities around the nation have taken up the initiative.

America 2000 called for the federal government to stimulate and support the development of new curriculum standards in core academic subjects. As a result, curriculum standards are either now available or are under development with federal support, in the areas of science, history, the arts, civics, geography, English, and foreign languages (Ravitch, 1993).

With the change in administrations from President Bush to President Clinton, the America 2000 strategy is being replaced by Goals 2000. There are many similarities between America 2000 and Goals 2000 that go beyond their names. The community-based portion of America 2000 has been retained, as has the emphasis on standard setting. Goals 2000 would codify the National Education Goals, formally authorize the National Education Goals Panel, establish a federal role in creating a

system of standards and assessments, and create a grant program to stimulate and support school restructuring (*Education Week*, October 13, 1993, page 22).

The National Science Foundation (NSF) is also using the create-a-vision strategy. In 1990, the NSF Directorate for Science and Engineering announced a statewide systemic initiative program in science, mathematics, and engineering education (National Science Foundation, 1990). States were to submit proposals addressing how they would change the following aspects of their education system: (1) organizational structure and decision making, (2) provision and allocation of resources, (3) recruitment and preparation of teachers and college faculty, (4) retention and continuing professional development of teachers and other professional personnel, (5) curriculum content and learning goals, (6) delivery of instruction, including use of educational technology, (7) assessment of student achievement, (8) facilities and equipment, (9) articulation within the system, and (10) accountability systems. In short, states were to show how they would restructure their entire education system in science, mathematics, and engineering education. Each proposal required the commitment of the governor and chief state school officer. Awards were to be for five years and up to $10 million. To date, NSF has funded 25 states plus Puerto Rico in its SSI initiative.

NSF's statewide systemic initiatives program is unique in a number of ways. First, relatively small amounts of federal funding are provided to leverage large state education investments. Second, the procurement mechanism was a grants announcement; thus states are not held to specific deliverables. Rather than NSF offering a particular vision of school restructuring, states are being enticed into developing and implementing their own vision; in the grants announcement only four pages were used to describe what was wanted from states. Proposals varied greatly in approach, and most states are struggling in the early years of their work. NSF is sufficiently enamored of this approach that they have begun urban and rural systemic initiative programs.

Federally funded education research and development also plays an important role in the create-a-vision strategy for school restructuring. Since the mid-1950s, there has been at least some small investment in education research and development. In 1973, the National Institute of Education was created to provide greater visibility and focus to these efforts; that agency continues today under the name of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Much of the federally supported cognitive science research underlies the curriculum standard setting portion of school restructuring. Research on tracking has contributed to recommendations to restructure schools so that all students are better served. More recently the federal government has begun to target research directly on school restructuring, such as CORS. While connections between federally supported research and school restructuring are not always direct and easily seen, a good argument can be made that federal investments in education research and development play a substantial role in creating a vision for school restructuring. (For development of this line of reasoning, see Chapter 2 of the National Research Council's report, *Research in Education Reform*, 1992.)

*Revising Federal Programs to Better Fit School Restructuring*

A third federal strategy is to give specific attention to the needs of school restructuring when reauthorizing major federal programs. The U.S. Department of Education has drafted a bill for reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that would make this $10 billion a year investment supportive of school restructuring in a number of ways: high standards for all children; a focus on teaching and learning; flexibility to stimulate school-based initiatives coupled with responsibility for student performance; links among schools, parents, and communities (*Education Week*, October 20, 1993). ESEA's Chapter 1 program is to place greater emphasis on schoolwide programs and support professional development necessary for teachers to assist low-achieving students to master demanding content. Standardized multiple-choice basic skills tests are to

be replaced by performance-based accountability systems for program evaluation. This move would replace what had been a constraint to school restructuring with a positive influence for upgrading the quality of teaching for low-income students.

The three federal strategies described above share common features. All three are based largely on appeals to authority and do not incorporate powerful sanctions or incentives (though Goals 2000 and the lure of Chapter 1 funds may become powerful incentives). The strategies are minimally prescriptive, advocating general goals and broad standards, not highly specific curricula, pedagogy, or school governance. They are consistent with one another. For example, NAEP operationalizes measures that correspond to objectives outlined by the National Education Goals Panel, which in turn clarifies some objectives briefly discussed in *A Nation At Risk*.

These strategies are designed primarily to initiate, not support, school restructuring. Generally the strategies have been comprehensive, pursuing both the depth and breadth of school restructuring rather than focusing on a single aspect (though NSF initiatives focus on math, science, and technology). Except for *A Nation At Risk*, the federal strategies have been designed to be sustained, though political turnover has caused some disruptions.

State Strategies

Some states have been especially active in promoting school restructuring, employing a wide variety of strategies; others have not. Many state initiatives have been chronicled in National Governors' Association publications (David, Cohen, Honetschlager, & Traiman, 1990; David & Goren, 1993).

*Providing Systemic Support*

The currently most recommended state strategy for promoting school restructuring is to build a comprehensive and coherent system of support. While the concept of systemic reform at the state level has received a great deal of visibility and analysis in recent years (Smith & O'Day, 1991), there are, as yet, only emerging examples from which to learn. South Carolina offers the best example of an attempt to build a coherent and comprehensive system of state support for school reform, but in South Carolina the goal has been to guarantee basic skills for all students (Porter et al., 1993). California comes the closest to having a systemic approach to curriculum reform (Porter, Archbald, & Tyree, 1991). Kentucky is the best example of a state undertaking a comprehensive approach to school restructuring, but the pieces of the Kentucky strategy are just now being implemented. Still, the work of South Carolina, California, Kentucky, and other states serves to identify a number of policy instruments available to a state undertaking the task of building systemic support for school restructuring. McDonnell and Elmore (1987) provide an excellent analysis of several types of these policy instruments.

*State curriculum frameworks*. California is the state that has given greatest visibility to curriculum frameworks as an instrument to build systemic support. The 1985 California math frameworks were revolutionary in their call for a major shift toward applications and understanding and away from drill-and-practice skill development, together with a commitment to provide a more balanced curriculum to all students, not just the college bound. California has since revised its mathematics framework to better reflect the NCTM *Standards*. California has similarly ambitious and well-formulated curriculum frameworks in all academic subjects. Each framework is challenging of existing practice, both in the content that students are to master and in the levels of understanding and facility to reason and apply that students are to demonstrate.

For many states pursuing school restructuring reform, curriculum frameworks are the lead policy instrument. Frameworks tend to be more prescriptive than goals, but not as prescriptive and certainly not as behavioral in orientation as education objectives.

*Assessment of student academic achievement*. In the 1960s and 1970s, testing was typically the lead policy instrument in a reform to guarantee that all students master basic skills. In the 1980s, as the curriculum goal shifted toward the demanding student outcomes of problem solving and reasoning for all students, testing programs became an obstacle to change. Most states are currently in the process of dropping old testing programs and replacing them with new on-demand assessments. The switch from testing to assessment is important. Testing is seen as consisting of multiple-choice and true/false questions useful for assessing factual knowledge and low-level skill development, but not very good at assessing deep conceptual understanding and the ability to use conceptual understanding to solve novel problems and to reason, the goals of school restructuring. Performance assessments consist of tasks that are open-ended and complex and require much more time than a multiple-choice item. Student portfolios are samples of students work assembled over the course of a full school year or perhaps from kindergarten through twelfth grade. Vermont is the most visible state in the use of student portfolios. On-demand performance assessments are being undertaken by a number of states, including California and Maryland.

Student assessment is a policy instrument that is scrambling to catch up with the school restructuring movement. Many people believe that student assessment can replace curriculum frameworks as the lead policy instrument. First, however, a number of difficult technical problems remain to be solved: (a) how to adequately sample the domain of desired student outcomes (e.g., the curriculum framework) with relatively few tasks, each of which takes a considerable period of time (1 to 7 hours), (b) how to score student responses in ways that are free from scorer unreliability and bias, and (c) how to build assessment instruments and scoring procedures such that comparisons can

be made across time to see whether student performance is improving. For student portfolios, the technical issue of current greatest concern is scorer reliability (Koretz et al., 1992).

Student assessment through on-demand performance assessment and/or student portfolios is an important policy instrument in building systemic support for school restructuring. First, assessments can be used as a way to make concrete and tangible the desired outcomes of school restructuring. Highly visible assessment tasks provide a strong message to teachers, students, parents, and the public of what is to be accomplished. Second, through student assessment, gains in student achievement can be measured. If over time students do not achieve in the ways desired, adjustments to restructuring must be made. Kentucky plans to set achievement targets for each school with sanctions for schools not meeting the targets and teacher bonuses for schools that exceed them. Several states have school report card reporting requirements to ensure that assessment results and other school indicators are routinely put in the hands of school-level publics.

*School delivery standards* are a new policy instrument about which there is little clarity at the present time (most recently the name has been changed to opportunity to learn standards) (Porter, 1993a, 1993b). The motivation for school delivery standards is a concern for equity. If students are to be rewarded or penalized based on their performance, then what will protect students who have not had access to an effective education? Some believe that students should be held accountable for their performance only if they attend a school certified as meeting the school delivery standards. What school delivery standards are to include, therefore, are the variables that make up a quality education; these could be seen as the principles for restructuring a school. School delivery standards might require any one or all of the various types of school restructuring considered earlier in this paper.

The National Governors' Association (NGA) has given three states competitive grants to develop a version of school delivery standards. President Clinton's Goals 2000 calls for opportunity to learn standards to be developed in each state. There are a number of possibilities and problems to

be explored before school delivery standards become a policy instrument available to states in designing systemic support for school restructuring. The greatest potential appears to be in creating a vision for school restructuring. An important issue to be resolved beyond what pieces of school restructuring to include will be determining the appropriate level of prescriptiveness.

*Course requirements and other instructional time requirements*. A traditional policy instrument at the state level is the specification of numbers of credits of a particular subject required for graduation or, at the elementary school level, numbers of minutes of instructional time per day to be allocated to a particular subject area. These requirements can be more or less prescriptive. For example, in Florida and South Carolina, science requirements must be met through coursework satisfying a lab work minimum (20 percent of time in South Carolina and 40 percent of time in Florida). Some states have more than one type of graduation diploma, with the "advanced" diploma requiring not just three credits of mathematics, but one year of algebra and one year of geometry within the three-credit specification. Instructional time and course requirement policies may serve as constraints to some types of restructuring, for example, subject matter integration or a move to shift focus toward student accomplishment and away from earning credits.

*Instructional materials*. Eighteen states have textbook adoption policies. Typically, they involve a state adopting three to six different textbooks in a subject area and then stipulating that state support for the purchase of textbooks is dependent on schools and districts selecting books on the adoption list. Adoption cycles range from four to seven years.

The school restructuring focus on student experiences suggests an entirely new approach to the school curriculum, one with a much more substantial emphasis on active student learning, problem solving, reasoning, and application. Current textbooks and other instructional materials provide inadequate support to teachers who would like to change their instruction. Some argue that teachers should not make heavy use of textbook materials, but most teachers rely on textbooks to

support the instruction they provide.

States lack the resources to undertake materials development themselves, at least in a comprehensive way. However, states could use their textbook adoption procedures to force publishing houses into developing appropriate materials. California, with 12 percent of the elementary school textbook market, attempted this strategy in mathematics shortly after the 1985 mathematics framework was published. Perhaps because publishers were given only a year to come into alignment with the frameworks, the actual influence on publishers' materials was marginal. If there were a longer timeline and if states were to form a consortium in adoption practices, tremendous influence might be exerted on the publishing industry.

*Staff development*. For school restructuring to be successful, there will need to be changes in the knowledge and dispositions of teachers. Most teachers have never experienced the types of authentic instruction to be delivered in restructured schools (Newmann, 1991); they do not have a clear image of what such instruction entails. Many teachers lack the subject matter knowledge required for instruction that allows students to pursue their own curiosities, to learn through experimentation, and to explore topics in depth. The majority of teachers lack knowledge of the cognitive science base that underlies designing successful instruction leading to conceptual understanding and application.

At the present time, not a single state or district approaches staff development in a way that appears up to the challenge of supporting school restructuring. The general picture of staff development is one of relatively modest investment at the aggregate level, which becomes trivial when disaggregated to the teacher level. Staff development is fragmented in conception, episodic in delivery, and inconsistently distributed across teachers. What little staff development exists is typically designed and developed by individuals distant from the classroom who have little knowledge of the particular needs of a teacher or school staff. Generally, schools accept little responsibility for

staff development, which may explain why staff development is so consistently ineffective.

In theory, states could play an important role in designing, funding, and delivering staff development. The staff development component of California's Math A provides one example of the potential. Math A, developed by teachers but with state support, serves as a bridge course for students not yet ready to take Algebra 1 but who might, with help, still take college prep mathematics. Teachers of Math A must first complete five days of staff development to learn the purposes of Math A, the content of the 13 curriculum units that make up Math A, and the pedagogical strategies that are to be used (Porter et al., 1993).

States and other external agencies are unlikely to be able to satisfy fully the needs for staff development created by school restructuring. Schools must be led to accept substantial responsibility for identifying and meeting their own staff development needs. Such an approach would be consistent with the continuous improvement goal of Deming's Total Quality Management. It would also be consistent with the intentions of states and districts that require school improvement plans as a part of their effective schools initiatives. Nevertheless, in the CORS study of restructured schools, none of the schools identified thus far have had a meaningful staff development program. In some schools there is considerable participation in staff development, but the events are not well aligned to school goals and they do not add up in a way that meets the needs of restructuring.

*Higher education*. States vary in their relationships to the teacher education programs in their publicly supported colleges and universities. Some states have highly prescriptive requirements for teacher certification, including courses and internships. States could reconfigure their certification requirements such that new teachers would be more fully prepared to function in restructured schools. This concept could be extended to administrator certification as well.

Another potential component of a state systemic approach to supporting school restructuring concerns college entrance requirements. Specific illustrations are difficult, since restructuring can

take so many different forms. One possibility would be for colleges to revise their entrance requirements so that high schools are not discouraged from efforts to integrate instruction across disciplinary boundaries or to experiment with alternate forms of grading.

*Financial support*. The additional costs of restructured schools are not yet clear and are likely to vary substantially. Some design initiatives have attempted to constrain school restructuring to fit within current costs, at least after initial startup (e.g., the New American Schools Development Corporation). Active learning and student projects would seem to require more teacher time per student. School-based decision making also appears to require teacher time. Some restructuring initiatives call for more teacher planning time. More teachers will cost more money. In states seeking to increase lab work, lab space has been found to be inadequate both in amount and quality (Porter et al., 1993). Solving this problem will also have costs.

The greatest cost of school restructuring, however, is supporting the equity commitment. All students are to master challenging content and learn to reason and apply knowledge. Meeting this goal is not easy for suburban schools that have fairly good facilities and relatively well-motivated students with often strong home support. Meeting this goal in an inner-city school or a poor rural school presents an enormous challenge that surely requires substantial increases in financial support. Clune (1993) estimates that the additional costs of educating a student to high standards who comes from a low-income family is $2,000 per year in today's dollars, approximately half of which is being provided by state and federal compensatory education programs and approximately half of which is not now available.

Kentucky schools have been ruled unconstitutional in terms of the distribution of student expenditures; other states may follow. Since reducing inequities by taking away support from schools and giving it to others is politically impossible, the strategy must be to bring poorly supported schools up to the funding levels of the better supported schools. States committing to the equity piece of the

school restructuring agenda will need to provide substantial increases in funding for education.

*Communication*. All of the above eight policy mechanisms have a history at the state level, although they have rarely been put together in a coherent way to support school restructuring. A possible new policy mechanism for states concerns communication. A statewide communication network for schools attempting to restructure could be established (Lieberman & McLaughlin, 1992). This network would allow schools to learn from each other, to provide technical assistance to each other, and to break down the isolation that so often plagues teachers and schools when they undertake fundamental change.

Building systemic support for school restructuring at the state level is a strategy that, at its best, addresses all aspects of our emerging conceptual framework for strategies to stimulate and support school restructuring. In designing systemic support, a state should seek to create strategies that are initiating, such as curriculum frameworks, assessments, and school delivery standards, along with strategies that are supportive, such as instructional materials, staff development, financial support, and communication. Collectively, the several pieces of systemic support are to form a comprehensive strategy for school restructuring, though each of the pieces may be quite focused, such as assessment. Obviously, systemic support is a strategy to be sustained, although some of its pieces may be episodic. Systemic support is, by its definition, to be internally consistent with all of the pieces pushing in the same general direction. Efforts to build authority are achieved in several ways. Teachers and other experts are involved in designing curriculum frameworks, assessments, school delivery standards, and the like. These are then formally adopted by the state to give them legal authority. Elements of power also become a part of systemic support through, for example, student and school accountability tied to assessment. Because the strategy of systemic support is relatively new, there are not yet good examples employing all aspects of our conceptual framework, but that may happen in the future.

*Demonstration Sites*

A state could provide leadership for school restructuring through supporting demonstrations; however, the strategy requires having something to be demonstrated, which is often not the case in school restructuring. Possible school restructuring models that might be demonstrated include those by Sizer, Comer, Levin, and Slavin. To our knowledge, no state has yet taken this approach though non-state-sanctioned demonstrations of school restructuring abound.

Demonstration is a strategy that has been used a great deal in the past, especially at the federal level. The planned variation studies for Head Start and Follow Through are examples (Rivlin & Timpane, 1975), as is the Alum Rock Voucher Demonstration (Salganik, 1981). Demonstrations have not worked especially well in convincing people that change is necessary. Neither do demonstrations go very far in providing the knowledge, skill, and other resources needed for new sites to take on the challenge of implementation. However, demonstrations can create visibility and understanding of an innovation; they serve as existence proofs.

For a demonstration to be effective, both visibility and credibility are necessary. To provide visibility, several demonstration sites located across the geographic regions of the state would be needed. The number and dispersion of sites facilitates visibility and access to first-hand knowledge. Satisfying the credibility criterion is more complicated. Demonstrations should be conducted in schools similar to those where subsequent adoption is desired. A state might wish to have a demonstration site in an innercity location, a suburban location, and a rural location. Similarly, the state would be ill-advised to provide resources to demonstration sites that would not be available in subsequent adoptions.

Demonstrations tend to be comprehensive but episodic to initiate school restructuring. Demonstrations are quite prescriptive but gain their influence through appeals to authority rather than the rewards and sanctions of power.

*Incentive Grants*

Like the dissemination strategy, the incentive grant strategy is one that has been used for a variety of purposes in the past. But unlike demonstrations, incentives get their influence through the power of rewards. Typically, the size of the grant is much less than the cost of work to be done; the idea is to use relatively little state money to leverage local investment. In the early years, money is allocated to cover grants for only a fraction of the potential applicants. Over time the number of incentive grants could be increased to cover the entire state.

The state of Washington funds 21 restructuring projects, most of which are in individual schools. Funding ranges from $60,000 to $200,000 per year for six-year awards. Maine issued a grants announcement in 1987 from which each of three schools received $50,000 for each of three years; nineteen schools submitted proposals. Massachusetts ran an incentive grants competition in 1988, funding seven schools for $30,000 each; 38 proposals were submitted. In each example, the call for proposals was general, putting local creativity at a premium (David, Cohen, Honetschlager, & Traiman, 1990).

The grants announcement and any supporting material communicates what the state would like schools to be doing; grant announcements can be more or less prescriptive. A limitation to incentive grants is that they only influence schools willing to step forward. In theory, schools submitting proposals should have teachers and parents committed to change. In practice, a school application is often at the initiative of the principal with widespread commitment remaining in question.

Incentives are also sometimes used by states as a more focused strategy. For example, Michigan offers a $25 per student award to schools that raise their graduation requirements.

*Waivers*

Waivers represent a strategy for removing bureaucratic obstacles to school restructuring. Generally, waivers require local initiative. A school identifies a state requirement believed to impede local change; the impediment is made known to the state together with a rationale for why it should be removed. The state reviews the request and reaches a decision.

Allowing for waivers of formal state requirements is a relatively weak form of support for school restructuring. It involves no leadership and no support, only the willingness to stand aside if a case can be made that doing so will benefit school restructuring. Nevertheless, just knowing that waivers are possible can be energizing to local initiatives; those who wish to resist change cannot use "the state won't allow us" argument. Many states have procedures for allowing waivers of requirements, but surprisingly few requests have been received.

*Mandates*

The Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) of 1990 makes heavy use of mandates to bring about school restructuring. KERA mandates preschool programs for "at-risk" four-year-olds and extended services to provide extra instruction to low-achieving primary students. Nongraded primary schools (i.e., grades K-3) are mandated but without a prescribed design. Early research indicates great variability in strategies for and levels of school compliance (Raths & Fanning, 1993). Schools appear to be experimenting with new instructional practices: cooperative learning, peer tutoring, hands-on materials, and whole-language approaches that use trade books and other materials instead of basal textbooks.

Mandated Family Resource Centers and Youth Services Centers are charged with coordinating educational health and social services for children in ways that increase children's school readiness. The stand-alone design of the Centers offers no mechanism to encourage *consistent* policies across

organizations. Do preschool and extended service programs use instructional approaches and emphasize content that is consistent with the K-12 emphasis on higher order thinking and problem solving? Centers typically serve schools in a geographic area. In 1993, the state spent $15.5 million for 223 centers serving 414 schools in 103 of Kentucky's 176 school districts (Roeder, 1993).

Kentucky's mandates are designed to initiate school reform; collectively they are comprehensive and the state's intention is that they be sustained. The state is seeking fundamental change in several areas, and some of the changes are in potential tension with one another. To accommodate these tensions, Kentucky attempts to strike a balance between prescriptiveness and flexibility. Mandates gain their influence through being authoritative, though sometimes sanctions are applied when schools fail to comply.

*Choice, Vouchers, and Charter Schools*

Providing parents with greater control over where they send their children to school has been hypothesized as a powerful strategy for initiating school restructuring. Minnesota's open enrollment policy, implemented in 1988, gives parents the prerogative of sending their children to any public school in the state, with state aid following students. State aid covers only part of the cost of educating transfer students, and individual districts may opt out of the plan. Further, there is no funding to appraise parents of the plan and no money for student transportation. Two years after implementation, only 500 of Minnesota's 700,000 public school students, less than one-tenth of one percent, were participating in the choice plan (Bennett, 1990).

As of 1992, 13 states had laws permitting students to enroll in schools outside their residential school district, and 7 states had laws designed to encourage intradistrict transfers (Fossey, 1992). Most of these initiatives incorporate the same limitations as the Minnesota plan. A California voucher initiative that might have provided a better test of the strategy's potential was defeated at the polls in

1993 by a 2 to 1 margin.

Charter schools may take virtually any form, but legislatively authorized charter schools currently tend to be teacher-initiated, innovative, outcome-based, public schools (Sautter, 1993). Charter schools are publicly financed and are exempt from most state or district regulations. These schools operate under contract with the state or local school board and must be reapproved every three to five years.

Since 1992, five states have passed laws permitting charter schools, and many more have similar legislation pending. In all cases, legislation is aimed at increasing innovation in the broader system by increasing the number of actual alternatives to students who may have the legal prerogative of choice, but no real variety in the schools from which to choose.

California and Minnesota represent two different approaches to charter schools. Minnesota's law calls for up to 20 charter schools that are legally independent from the local school board. Conversion of an existing school to a charter requires approval of 90 percent of the faculty. California law permits up to 100 charter schools in as many as 10 districts. To convert an existing school, only 50 percent of the faculty must approve.

*Campaign to Change Public Opinion*

Increasingly, states are recognizing the important role that public opinion plays in school reform. In the words of a National Governors' Association (NGA) publication (1993),

> Change mandated from the state capital may technically move education reform forward, but for education to genuinely improve at the local level, the public must be involved in the process of reform from the outset. Grassroots support for education reform takes time and patience. An all-inclusive process to involve the different segments of the

community in defining what new education policy means will help ensure acceptance of change and increase public support. (p. 15)

There are numerous recent examples of states using the public opinion campaign strategy to support school restructuring. Vermont's reform initiative, The Green Mountain Challenge, has used more than 50 forums, involving over 4,000 citizens, to communicate in plain language why reform is needed and how schools are to change and to learn from the public their concerns and suggestions. When developing Minnesota Milestones, the state's blueprint for education reform, Governor Carlson consulted with more than 10,000 citizens to get their input on what needed to be done.

Other states have taken their education reform initiatives to the voters, although not always successfully. In 1992, Colorado Governor Romer took Amendment 6, Children First, before the voters. Amendment 6 called for raising education performance standards, decentralizing decision making, reducing class size, funding preschool, performance-based teacher pay, and a one cent sales tax. Despite $700,000 of private funds raised for a six-month campaign led by the Governor, the amendment failed. Antitax groups were able to get a repeal question on the ballot to negate Oklahoma's 1991 Comprehensive Education Act, which included a number of school reform initiatives and increased funding. Governor Walters was able to launch a successful campaign against the repeal initiative with $1.5 million of private funding and strong support from two of the state's largest circulation newspapers.

If fundamental and comprehensive change of schooling is to be accomplished, those who pay the bills will need to be convinced that change is needed and that the proposed changes are promising. This will not happen automatically. "Polls and focus groups repeatedly show that while governors and other policy makers and educators talk of higher standards and a richer curriculum, the public yearns for a return to the basics and the old fashioned discipline" (National Governors' Association, p. 7). Further, many of the reforms require increased expenditures on education, yet three-fourths of

voting adults in the United States do not have children in the public schools. Clearly, this overwhelming majority of voters needs to see that public education is an issue of importance to them. Carefully structured and well-financed public opinion campaigns are a promising but relatively new strategy for supporting school restructuring.

Clearly, a campaign to change public opinion is a versatile strategy that can be used to either initiate or support school restructuring. Public opinion campaigns tend to be focused and episodic, not at all prescriptive, and gain their influence through trappings of authority.

District Strategies

Virtually all of the strategies enumerated for states can and are being used by school districts. There are several examples of districts with especially strong efforts to initiate and support school restructuring, including Dade County, Florida; Chicago, Illinois; and Jefferson County, Kentucky. Districts can stimulate school restructuring through demonstration, incentive grants, choice, and campaigns to change public opinion. They can support school restructuring through granting waivers and building systemic support in the form of frameworks, assessment, staff development, and needed financial support.

In many ways, districts are especially well positioned to stimulate, provide incentives for, and support the restructuring of schools. They are closer to schools than are states and federal agencies; proximity and first-hand knowledge of people and conditions allows the tailoring of strategies to local circumstances.

Of course, districts vary substantially in size and resources. Big-city school districts and county districts have resources that rival those of states. These large districts have access to the full range of strategies enumerated for states. Other districts are tiny, many having only a single high school, with high school personnel often serving double duty as district administrators. In these small

school districts, many of the strategies enumerated for states would not be appropriate nor could they be afforded.

In addition to their own initiatives, districts have an important role to play vis-à-vis national and state initiatives. There is much that districts can do to raise the visibility of national and/or state leadership for school restructuring. Districts can adopt policies consistent with state and national initiatives, thus adding to their visibility at the local level. Districts can augment state and national initiatives with their own programs, for example, developing assessments consistent with state frameworks, providing technical assistance to state-supported demonstrations. Districts can also intentionally or unintentionally dampen the influence of national and state initiatives to restructure schools. District programs can create constraints such as a minimum competency test for high school graduation in a state with a framework seeking to promote emphasis on higher order thinking and problem solving for all students.

## The Role of Professional Organizations

Professional organizations have been an impressive force in the school restructuring movement. The primary strategies used by professional organizations are creating a general press and providing a vision.

### *Creating a General Press*

Starting in 1986 with *Time For Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education*, the NGA has provided report after report indicating the need for fundamental change in education and providing status reports on progress of state initiatives. NGA leadership through reports and forums has been especially effective; the organization is perfectly situated to enhance communication among states on what is being tried, as well as provide updates on successes and failures.

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, through its *Educational Leadership* magazine and the Phi Delta Kappa professional society, through its *Kappan*, have done excellent jobs of keeping the national conversation about school restructuring alive and moving forward. Only the most remote and unconnected educators have managed to escape the reaches of the school restructuring movement.

The comprehensive strategy of creating a press for school restructuring does not ensure in any way that schools will change, relying on expert authority to be persuasive. Nevertheless, the collective efforts of professional organizations in promoting school restructuring are impressive and have undoubtedly had their effect.

*Creating a Vision*

The best examples of professional organizations providing a vision to initiate school restructuring can be found in curriculum standards. The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics' (NCTM) *Curriculum and Evaluation Standards for School Mathematics* (1989) is not only one of the most visible documents in education today, but it is a document that stimulated curriculum standard setting in other subject areas by other professional organizations. The American Association for the Advancement of Science published a set of benchmarks for science literacy in 1993. The National Research Council (NRC) of the National Academy of Sciences will publish science standards in 1994.

The NCTM has gone well beyond its curriculum standards in efforts to create a vision for school restructuring, publishing *Professional Standards for Teaching Mathematics* (1991). NCTM assessment standards are under development. These NCTM documents provide detailed and comprehensive descriptions of restructured student experiences. Collectively, the curriculum, teaching, and assessment standards will provide a comprehensive vision of good mathematics learning

and teaching that can be drawn on by educators across the nation as they seek to restructure their schools.

NCTM's assessment standards are highly focused, consistent, and fairly prescriptive. The involvement of large numbers of teachers in the drafting of key documents and the organization's use of year-long publicity campaigns has provided authority.

NRC's Mathematical Sciences Education Board (MSEB) is hard at work producing publications to add to the vision of school restructuring. In 1989, MSEB published *Everybody Counts*. In 1991, MSEB convened a national summit on assessment, which led to *For Good Measure* (1991) followed by *Measuring Up* (1993) and *Measuring Counts: A Conceptual Guide for Mathematics Assessment* (1993).

*Providing Technical Assistance*

To a limited extent, professional organizations have also used technical assistance as a strategy for supporting school restructuring. In 1988, the Education Commission of the States joined forces with Sizer's Coalition of Essential Schools to create Re:Learning. The Re:Learning alliance recognizes that fundamental and comprehensive change at the school level requires reform of the system in which schools work. Over 200 schools in 23 states are formally involved in Re:Learning. A National Re:Learning Faculty consists of a large team of persons experienced in essential schools who are available as technical consultants to schools, districts, and states undertaking school restructuring (Sizer, 1992).

The Education Commission of the States has also created a communications kit, "Communicating About Restructuring," for states undertaking public opinion campaigns in support of school restructuring (National Governors' Association, 1993).

Technical assistance is a supporting strategy that can be either focused or comprehensive, but to be effective must be sustained. Technical assistance must be consistent with the restructuring efforts being supported and gains power to the extent educators see benefits.

## The Role of the Courts

State and federal courts have provided strong impetus to school restructuring. Magnet and charter schools have become instruments of court ordered desegregation. In Kentucky, the entire public education system was ruled unconstitutional, which led to the most comprehensive state plan for school restructuring (KERA).

### *Magnet Schools*

Magnet schools predate the school restructuring movement. Nevertheless, many of the properties of magnet schools are properties of restructured schools. The Kansas City Public School System has been under federal court order to desegregate since 1986. The district's plan transforms virtually all of its 78 schools into magnet schools. The state has put the price tag at $1.2 billion for building renovation and construction, student transportation, new instructional equipment and materials, faculty and staff, professional development, and administrative expenses. As of January 1992, spending for construction and renovation alone had exceeded $500 million (*Wall Street Journal*, January 7, 1992). When state voters rejected a proposal to raise $365 million in new taxes to fund the initiative, the court ordered the state to levy new taxes.

Kansas City's magnet schools enjoy student-to-teacher ratios far below the state average, from 175-200 hours annually in professional development for teachers, technical assistance from specialists in private industry and higher education, and extended day programs to remediate low-achieving students. Every school receives expensive equipment and materials to support instruction. One

school moved to a new $32 million facility, another spent $4.5 million for computer hardware and software. The agribusiness magnet will operate a small farm; the health science magnet will house a clinic in which professional nurses and physicians augment instruction.

Kansas City is unique in that it has only magnet schools and its plan is so well funded. However, magnet schools nationally are better funded than other schools and are much more likely than nonmagnets to promote curricular innovation and organizational change (e.g., Metz, 1986). Magnet schools, whether created by districts under direct order or selected as one of a limited number of legally acceptable alternatives for remedying discrimination, have constituted one of the major sources of school restructuring.

*Charter Schools*

Charter schools are created from scratch for the purpose of serving a distinctive educational mission that cannot be easily incorporated into existing schools. Although state legislatures have recently focused attention on how this tool might be used to initiate restructuring, local districts and the courts have been employing it for some time. Court orders to desegregate rarely instruct districts to create new schools, but court orders and consent decrees often accommodate district preference for this strategy.

Charter schools typically receive special financial support and enjoy a high level of autonomy from district and state regulation. Teacher unions are commonly involved in the conception of charter schools because these initiatives often require departures from existing collective bargaining agreements. In the CORS national search for restructured schools, two of the first six schools chosen are charter schools, suggesting the power of the strategy.

One CORS charter school is a magnet with unique features including: (1) teacher and parent joint responsibility for budgeting, staffing, curricular content, and instructional practices; (2)

differentiated staffing; (3) partnerships with multinational corporations; and (4) extra district funding for low student-teacher ratios, higher pay, and 20 contract days annually for teacher professional development. The other CORS charter school has a special mission to serve economically disadvantaged and minority students. The consent decree under which the school was created mandates increased staffing and smaller classes, specifies parameters for racial and socioeconomic composition, and requires a school-based management team. Only teachers who pledge support to the educational mission of the school are considered for positions.

Obviously, charter and magnet schools are strategies to initiate and sustain school restructuring. They tend to be nonprescriptive but often are comprehensive in their effect. The examples given illustrate the use of both authority and power to gain influence.

*Unconstitutional School Systems*

In October 1989, Kentucky's state supreme court declared the entire public school system unconstitutional. In the court's view, the state system of education fell far short of any reasonable standard for adequate public education as required by the state constitution. The state ordered the legislature and state education agency to establish a system that provides meaningful and comparable educational opportunities to all children. The result was KERA, the most comprehensive and powerful state initiative to stimulate school restructuring to date.

Independent Organizations Created to Support School Restructuring

Organizations have been created specifically to serve the purposes of school restructuring. The New American Schools Development Corporation (NASDC) was created as a part of President Bush's America 2000 initiative. NASDC is a nonprofit organization established by business leaders and operated with donated private funds. The purpose of NASDC is to provide the research and

development capability for creating "a new generation of American schools." NASDC was not able to raise the initially targeted $200 million and subsequently scaled back its intentions. As a result of a 1992 competition, 11 design teams are developing model alternative schools. These models are to be demonstrated in sites around the country, and, if proven successful, disseminated on a national scale.

The New Standards Project is a privately funded not-for-profit organization created by the Learning Research and Development Center at Pittsburgh and the National Center for Education and the Economy at Rochester. The New Standards Project seeks to support school restructuring through working with partner states and large school districts to develop new assessments of academic student achievement. Assessments are hypothesized to be an effective mechanism for communicating a new vision of learning and teaching. The work includes both the development of on-demand performance assessments as well as portfolios. As with the case of the NASDC initiative, the New Standards Project is too early in its work to anticipate results.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is a third example of an organization created to support school restructuring. The mission of this new not-for-profit organization is to design assessment procedures for certifying excellent teachers at all levels and in all subject matter areas. The purpose is to strengthen the teaching profession in ways that will support school restructuring. Funding has come from the federal government and several private foundations. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is nearing the end of its research and development stage and will, in the coming year, conduct its first assessments of volunteer teachers.

There are also new independent organizations to support school restructuring at the state level. The best example is Kentucky's Pritchard Committee. Named after its chair, Edward Pritchard, the committee is a nonpartisan, independent group that has led Kentucky's school restructuring reform since 1982. The Pritchard Committee's statewide town forum campaign in 1984 (enhanced by sessions in all 178 school districts in the state) ultimately led to the passage of the Kentucky

Education Reform Act in 1990. The Committee continues its work, focusing on implementation of the state's school restructuring package. Other examples are North Carolina's Public School Forum and Minnesota's Academic Excellence Foundation.

State-level independent organizations, created to support school restructuring, have proven an especially effective strategy in launching massive public opinion campaigns, getting school reform legislation passed, and getting new funds for education appropriated. Through these organizations for school restructuring, public opinion is turned from a constraint to a leverage point, keeping the pressure on educators to restructure their schools.

The Role of Independent Developers

Some of the most highly publicized attempts to restructure schools involve independent developers (e.g., James Comer's site-based, professional management team approach, Theodore Sizer's *Coalition of Essential Schools*, Henry Levin's *Accelerated Schools* program, and Robert Slavin's *Success for All*). Most developers are university scholars who have turned their attention to school reform.

The Coalition of Essential Schools reports working with 152 high schools. The *Accelerated Schools* program claims 500 schools in 33 states, including schools still in the planning phase. Slavin's (1992) *Success for All* is being implemented in 70 sites. Slavin's *Roots and Wings* and Sizer, Comer and others' *ATLAS Communities* initiative are two of 11 NASDC projects that may eventually be broadly disseminated. Nevertheless, with over 80,000 public schools and 25,000 private schools in the U.S., the combined direct impact of independent developers on school practice remains slight (U.S. Department of Education, 1993).

Independent developers for school restructuring help shape debate about education reform. Through demonstrations, they heighten public interest in school restructuring and bolster the

conviction of educators and policymakers that public schools can overcome current problems.

Most independent developers appear to agree on five basic premises:

(1) American education is in crisis.

(2) Social scientific and education research conducted during the last two to three decades has produced a sound base of knowledge for understanding the learning process and the relationships among schools, their communities, and the broader society.

(3) Comprehensive change is necessary to enable schools to fulfill their mission.

(4) Highly *prescriptive* "blueprints" for school or classroom practice fail. Schools need general principles to guide meaningful change.

(5) Restructuring requires *consistency* in school practices in areas such as staffing and budgeting, curriculum and instruction, assessment, and professional development.

Two of the first six schools selected by CORS are affiliated with an independent developer. One is a Levin Accelerated School, and the other is a Sizer Essential School.

Levin's model calls for redesigning the elementary school to provide early intensive intervention so that students do not fall behind. School-based management teams allow teachers, administrators, and parents to engage in shared decision making to identify clear goals for student performance, strategies for achieving goals, and methods for assessing progress. The Accelerated Schools organization requires interested schools to secure outside support before being admitted to the network. Districts must agree to provide release time for teachers to receive a six-day inservice and to provide release time for teachers to meet for a minimum of 36 additional hours during the first year of the project for planning and coordinating implementation. Staff from assisting organizations (e.g., the district, the local university) travel to the national center to receive training to become

"regional training teams" that provide the professional development and technical support to network schools.

The Coalition of Essential Schools (1992) has developed a distinctive framework for helping high schools restructure with a focus on authentic instruction. To qualify for Coalition membership, the governing school board and the majority of a school's faculty must approve. The Coalition does not provide direct funding but offers substantial technical support and inservice training for teachers. Intensive two-week summer workshops are conducted at the Coalition's national center, and the Coalition has a national network of advisors who provide limited direct assistance to member schools. In each of the first three years, $50,000 is needed to provide release time and travel money for teachers to attend inservices.

Independent developers of restructured schools commit the bulk of their initial energy to designing a framework for school restructuring and to communicating their mission to schools, the public, and funding agents. After this initial stage of development, dissemination and technical support for network schools takes over as a central activity. One unfortunate consequence is the lack of investment in documentation. Much of what could be learned from individual initiatives is being lost.

Of the strategies reviewed here, the work of independent developers is the most comprehensive in addressing all aspects of school restructuring. The intention is to both initiate and support restructuring through sustained relationships with a few schools. The efforts of independent developers tend to be internally consistent but often not consistent with the policies and practices of the sites in which the schools are embedded.

The Role of Business

American business has very much been a part of the school restructuring movement from the beginning. One of the most important roles that business has played has been inadvertent. As American business lost out to Asian and European competitors, concern for the economic future of our nation rose. Starting with *A Nation At Risk*, education reform reports have used business's weakening competitive position as an argument for creating a better educated workforce. In the words of *A Nation Prepared* (1986),

> The 1980s will be remembered for two developments: the beginning of the sweeping reassessment of the basis of the nation's economic strength and an outpouring of concern for the quality of American education. The connections between these two streams of thought is strong and growing. . . . In this report we first show how the changing nature of the world economy makes it necessary not simply to reverse the declining performance of the schools to which the first round of reform was addressed, but to reach far higher standards than any before. (p. 11)

Caught up in the connections between economic competitiveness and education excellence, business leaders have become chief spokespersons for school restructuring. Ross Perot led the charge for a massive education reform plan in Texas. David Kearns, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Xerox Corporation, joined Secretary of Education Lamar Alexander in the U.S. Department of Education and then took over the leadership of the NASDC Corporation. The Business Roundtable has made education one of its primary areas of activity.

Beyond being one of many participants in creating a press for education change, the business community has played several more direct roles in school restructuring. Management strategies developed in the business sector have been transplanted to education. Deming's Total Quality Management (1982) has received considerable attention in education circles. Representatives from

Mt. Edgecumbe High School in Alaska, a successful application of Deming's strategy, have travelled the nation advocating total quality management as a strategy of school restructuring. School-based decision making is another idea borrowed from the business sector (Lewis, 1989).

Business involvement in school restructuring also has occurred through the "adopt a school" strategy. A local business adopts a school, pledging to provide assistance of some type: provision of expertise ranging from management and accounting to subject-matter knowledge, providing opportunities for students to connect academic learning to real world settings, providing incentives in the form of college scholarships to students who do well in school. Each of these special relationships has undoubtedly strengthened the participating school and provided important benefits to students. The pattern of adopt-a-school business initiatives has been sporadic, however, and the number of schools, students, and teachers reached thus far has been insignificant (Levine & Trachtman, 1988).

American business presence can be found in many of the other strategies described earlier. The NASDC school design initiative was created with business partnership. The Pritchard Committee is made up of business leaders and draws on businesses for financial support. The Michigan Partnership for New Education provides yet another example of a school restructuring initiative with an important business presence. A. Alfred Taubman, a shopping mall magnate, has provided much of the funding and currently serves as Chairman of the Board of Directors. The Michigan Partnership begun in 1991 draws on the resources of the business community, the university community, K-12 schools, and state government in efforts to bring about fundamental change in Michigan public education. With state and business support, universities are working to create a statewide network of professional development schools. These restructured schools are places committed to continuing improvement where school and university faculty work as colleagues to design and deliver the best education possible for all children. A professional development school is not only a place where K-

12 students learn, it serves as an excellent site for prospective teachers to serve internships.

Teacher Unions

Teacher unions and collective bargaining agreements are commonly cited as presenting some of the major constraints to school restructuring. Union contracts are blamed for placing limits on class size, making it impossible for larger classes to free up faculty planning time. Union preference for seniority as the basis for teacher transfers is said to reduce the ability of restructuring schools to maintain faculty commitment to a common mission. Union contracts can prohibit differentiated staffing (e.g., mentor or lead teacher programs) and prevent lead teachers from evaluating peers in cases where the peers' employment status or salary are at issue. Despite these problems, McDonnell and Pascal (1988) found that state and local teacher unions rarely seek to block reforms outright and generally accommodate workplace reforms advanced by others. There are even recent indications that unions are prepared to play a more active role in promoting school restructuring.

One area into which teacher unions have recently ventured is that of renegotiating collective bargaining agreements to facilitate restructuring while simultaneously securing higher pay and other benefits for teachers. For example, in Rochester, New York, teachers received a 40 percent pay raise over three years in exchange for a contract that waives seniority as a basis for teacher transfers, replaces years of experience and extra education with a performance-based career ladder, and gives teachers increased responsibility for communicating with students' parents and participating in site-based decision making (Lewis, 1989). In Arizona, a local NEA affiliate is participating in a career-ladder experiment in which participating teachers are subject to peer evaluation and student achievement on standardized achievement tests accounts for up to half of the score on which advancement is based (McDonnell & Pascal, 1988).

At the national level, the NEA and AFT have begun to invest their own resources in initiatives that promote restructuring. For example, the NEA has established the Mastery in Learning Project (NEA, 1988) in which 27 schools use site-based decision making to redesign curricula and instructional delivery. The AFT has opened several regional centers in reform-minded cities such as Chicago to provide technical support to local affiliates whose members are involved in restructuring.

## Putting the Pieces Together

Definitions of school restructuring are broad and inclusive, both in terms of approach and in terms of intended outcomes. The defining elements are less the specific types of changes than the number and magnitude of changes. Restructured schools are schools that have made important changes in the experiences provided for students, the organizational features of the school, the ways that teachers work with each other, and the connections between the school and its community. As a result, virtually any strategy for promoting school change becomes a candidate for promoting school restructuring, not by itself but in concert with other strategies aimed at changing other pieces of the school restructuring puzzle.

While there are many conceptions of a restructured school, there is no theory to guide strategies for stimulating and supporting school restructuring. This is analogous to the early days of the effective schools movement; knowing the characteristics of an "effective school" did not go very far toward knowing how to create an "effective school." Those who wish to promote school restructuring must either borrow from strategies of previous education reforms, all of which differ in important ways from the school restructuring reform, or limit their strategy to what can be drawn from experience and common sense. Similarly, those who wish to study school restructuring must make sense out of the countless attempts to initiate restructuring without a theory to guide their work.

We have no theory to offer, but we do have the beginnings of a structure for thinking about strategies to promote school restructuring. We distinguish between strategies that are (1) intended to initiate versus support school restructuring, (2) comprehensive versus focused, and (3) sustained versus episodic. We distinguish strategies according to their consistency, prescriptiveness, authority, and power.

In our analysis, we discovered 16 distinct strategies to promote school restructuring, with one strategy, systemic support, being comprised of 10 substrategies. There are more strategies that seek to initiate school restructuring than there are strategies built to support school restructuring. Many of the strategies are focused on a single piece of the restructuring puzzle, though there are increasing numbers of comprehensive restructuring strategies such as the Kentucky reform and the work of several independent developers. Unfortunately, the bulk of strategies to initiate or support school restructuring are episodic rather than sustained, though again there are some impressive exceptions, including the long-term commitment by the National Governors' Association to work at stimulating school restructuring.

Strategies for promoting school restructuring are more likely to rely on general principles than prescriptions, leaving considerable discretion to local schools for interpretation. This lack of prescriptiveness in strategies places great demands on local school capacity and leadership. The strategies rely more on authority than on power for having influence. Those who wish to promote school restructuring appear to be much more inclined to try to persuade educators, parents, and the public that change is needed than they are to require change. They also are unlikely to hold out rewards and punishments conditioned on change, though the use of rewards and punishments is not totally missing from the school restructuring movement.

Mandates and empowerment strategies exist side by side at the national level and sometimes even among the strategies employed by a single agency. In some cases, site-based decision making

has even been mandated. Strategies for promoting school restructuring have largely left the locus of control for change to the school level, even when mandates are used. We did not find a single example of a strategy to promote school restructuring that did not require a great deal of school-level initiative and school-level interpretation.

Virtually everybody has gotten into the act of school restructuring. Federal, state, and district levels of the school hierarchy have each employed a variety of strategies to promote school restructuring. Outside the formal school hierarchy, virtually every professional education organization has used one or more initiatives to promote school restructuring. Whole new independent organizations have been developed solely for the purpose of promoting school restructuring. The courts, businesses, teachers' unions, and independent developers have all played a role. In the aggregate, the number and types of strategies used to promote school restructuring and the range of organizations and individuals interested in using those strategies are impressive.

## Does It All Add Up?

We found no evidence of an overall strategy at the national level for promoting and supporting school restructuring. Plans for systemic reform at the state level are the closest approximation, but systemic reform is just getting underway and even when complete may only apply to state-controlled initiatives. This finding is not surprising, since there is no good mechanism available for creating an overall national strategy. The federal government might take the lead and, to some extent, that was attempted during the Bush administration with America 2000. But the federal role in education has always been limited in the United States. A limited federal role was even recognized and accepted in America 2000.

The lack of a national strategy for promoting school restructuring and the inclusiveness of what school restructuring means have resulted in some problems. There are inconsistencies in

approaches to promoting school restructuring that create confusion at the level of individual schools. We discovered one school operating under a federally required parent advisory council, a state required school site council, and a district required site-based decision-making council. Each of the three councils had different specific requirements, so that all three could not be satisfied with a single council.

Inconsistencies among strategies is not, however, the largest problem created by the lack of a national strategy. When viewed from the school level, we found serious gaps among the various strategies to stimulate and support school restructuring. First, we found surprisingly little use of the technical assistance strategy. Staff development was found to be in short supply, and what little was available didn't appear to make much sense from the perspective of a restructuring school. Lots of agencies have limited efforts to provide technical assistance, but across agencies the efforts are uncoordinated and not substantial. A second gap concerns documentation and evaluation of results. What little documentation and evaluation exists focuses on the effects of a restructured school and not on the effects of strategies to promote school restructuring. We fear that missed opportunities for self-monitoring and improvement may result in the movement stagnating for lack of new insights. Evaluation of strategies to promote restructuring will not be easy. Many strategies exist, simultaneously all bearing on the same schools; colinearity among potential influences will be hard to unravel. Further, most strategies to promote school restructuring lack clear goals against which to judge success or failure.

Yet a third gap among strategies concerns constraints. Most approaches to school restructuring appear to require more work for teachers, administrators, and students. Working harder is possible over the short haul but is difficult to sustain. We found too little attention given to this constraint, which, if not remedied, will likely result in the collapse of promising school restructuring. An emerging constraint needing attention concerns mobility of education leaders. Where good examples of restructured schools exist, one or more individuals are identified as leaders in the effort.

These individuals are much sought after, frequently leaving the school to climb the administrative ladder or distracted from the school by calls to provide advice and technical assistance. By arguing that a national strategy for initiating and supporting school restructuring is needed, we are not suggesting that any one approach should be followed. Rather, our point is that without a national strategy the multiple strategies taken by many different agencies simultaneously are not likely to add up to a comprehensive and coherent plan that makes sense from the perspective of a school. Crucial support will not be provided because the need will go unrecognized. Strategies will get in each other's way due to inconsistencies, and needed evaluation will not occur because the efforts are too fragmented and episodic to be recognized as an overall strategy in need of evaluation. Our analysis leads us to believe that a national strategy would lead to more agencies using a wider variety of methods to better initiate and support school restructuring.

A few strategies for promoting school restructuring seem especially promising from the perspective of our framework. The work of professional organizations in creating a general press for school restructuring and their work in creating a vision are two. The collective work of professional organizations appears to be bringing about an important shift in the way our nation thinks about the purposes and most appropriate forms of schooling. These two strategies by themselves are unlikely to result in large numbers of restructured schools, though some schools will be sufficiently motivated and have the capacity to undertake and complete the process on their own. Nevertheless, school restructuring will not happen on any scale unless there is first a massive shift in beliefs about what schools can and should accomplish and about how schools should proceed. The work of professional organizations over the course of the past half dozen years appears to be going a long way toward creating this condition.

At this time, there are relatively few good examples of restructured schools. Inferring from those few examples is dangerous. Nevertheless, given the brief time frame of the school restructuring

movement, charter schools, the work of independent developers, and Kentucky's massive school reform appear to be especially promising strategies. The apparent successes of the first two strategies may in part be explained by their focus on a few highly motivated schools. Independent developers tend to work with schools that volunteer; court-ordered charter schools are in locations where past education efforts have been considered inadequate. The success of the Kentucky strategy may or may not end up being limited to a few isolated schools, but at least the goal is to bring about fundamental and comprehensive change in every school in the state.

The picture of stimulating and supporting school restructuring is one of attempting to do a lot with a little. Restructuring large numbers of schools is an ambitious goal that, on the face of it, would appear to require a massive investment. What we find is the opposite. NSF attempts to leverage entire state systems with a $2 million per year five-year investment. Independent developers work with only a handful of carefully selected schools. Decentralization and accountability are created without providing the technical assistance necessary for schools to be successful. Still, a great deal of good appears to be happening in some classrooms and in some schools. Whether the entire education system in the nation is moving toward a point where a great deal more good will be accomplished remains unclear.

References

Archbald, D., & Porter, A. C. (1991). *The role of assessment in education reform.* Paper prepared for the Office of Technology Assessment.

Atkinson, R. C., & Jackson, G. B. (Eds.). (1992). *Research and education reform: Roles for the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Bennett, D. A. (1990). Choice and desegregation. *Choice and control in American education (Vol. 2): The practice of choice, decentralization and school restructuring.* Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Berends, M., & King, M. B. (in press). A description of restructuring in nationally nominated schools: Legacy of the iron cage? *Educational Policy.*

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1978). *Federal programs supporting educational change.* Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century.* Washington, DC: Author.

Chubb, J. E., & Moe, T. M. (1990). *Politics, markets, and America's schools.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Clune, W. H. (1993, September). The shift from equity to adequacy in school finance. *The World & I, 8*(9), 389-405.

Cohen, M. (1988). *Restructuring the education system: Agenda for the 1990s.* Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.

Comer, J. P. (1980). *School power: Implications of an intervention project.* New York: Free Press.

David, J. L., Cohen, M., Honetschlager, D., & Traiman, S. (1990). *State actions to restructure schools: First steps*. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.

David, J. L., & Goren, P. D. (1993). *Transforming education: Overcoming barriers*. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.

Deming, W. E. (1982). *Out of the crisis*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Center for Advanced Engineering Study.

Elmore, R. F. (1990). *Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fennema, E., Carpenter, T. P., & Peterson, P. L. (1989). Learning mathematics with understanding: Cognitively Guided Instruction. In J. E. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in research on teaching, Volume 1* (pp. 195-222). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Fossey, R. (1992). *School choice legislation: A survey of the states*. New Brunswick, NJ: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Fuhrman, S. H., & Malen, B. (1991). *The politics of curriculum and testing: The 1990 yearbook of the Politics of Education Association*. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. G. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Improving America's Schools Act of 1993: The reauthorization of The Elementary and Secondary Education Act and amendments to other acts [Forum]. (1993, October 20). *Education Week*, pp. 19-34.

Koretz, D., McCaffrey, D., Klein, S., Bell, R., & Stecher, B. (1992). *Reliability of scores from the 1992 Vermont Portfolio Assessment Program* (Interim report). Washington, DC: Rand.

Levin, H. M. (1988). *Accelerated schools of at-risk students*. New Brunswick, NJ: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Levine, M., & Trachtman, R. (1988). *American business and the public school*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lewis, A. (1989). *Restructuring American schools*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1990). Restructuring schools: What matters and what works. *Phi Delta Kappan, 71*, 759-764.

McDonnell, L. M., & Elmore, R. F. (1987). Getting the job done: Alternative policy instruments. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 9*(2), 133-152.

McDonnell, L. M., & Pascal, A. (1988). *Teacher unions and educational reform*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Metz, M. H. (1986). *Different by design: The context and character of three magnet schools*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Mullis, V. S., Owen, E. H., Phillips, G. W. (1990). *Accelerating academic achievement: A summary of findings from 20 years of NAEP*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Murphy, J. (1991). *Restructuring schools: Capturing and assessing the phenomena*. New York: Teachers College Press.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1993). *The condition of education 1993*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (1989). *Curriculum and evaluation standards for school mathematics*. Reston, VA: Author.

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (1991). *Professional standards for teaching mathematics*. Reston, VA: Author.

National Education Association. (1988). *Mastery in learning project*. Washington, DC: Author.

National Governors' Association. (1986). *Time for results: The governors' 1991 report on education*. Washington, DC: Author.

National Governors' Association. (1990, February 25). *National education goals*. Washington, DC: Author.

National Governors' Association. (1993). *A guide to building public support for education reform*. Washington, DC: Author.

National Research Council, Mathematical Sciences Education Board. (1993). *Measuring what counts: A conceptual guide for mathematics assessment*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

National Research Council, Mathematical Sciences Education Board. (1993). *Measuring up: Prototypes for mathematics assessment*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

National Research Council, Mathematical Sciences Education Board, Board on Mathematical Sciences, and Committee on the Mathematical Sciences in the Year 2000. (1989). *Everybody counts: A report to the nation on the future of mathematics education*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

National Science Foundation. (1990). *Statewide systemic initiatives in science, mathematics, and engineering education--Program solicitation*. Washington, DC: Author.

Newmann, F. M. (1991, February). Linking restructuring to authentic student achievement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 458-463.

Newmann, F. M. (1993). What is a restructured school? *Principal*, *72*(3), 5-8.

Palincsar, A., & Brown, A. L. (1984, Spring). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction*, pp. 117-175.

Pitsch, M. House action on President's 'Goals 2000' proposal imminent. 1993, October 13). *Education Week*, p. 22.

Porter, A. C. (1989). A curriculum out of balance: The case of elementary school mathematics. *Educational Researcher, 18*(5), 9-15.

Porter, A. C. (1989). External standards and good teaching: The pros and cons of telling teachers what to do. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11*(4), 343-356.

Porter, A. C. (1992). *Some thoughts on school delivery standards*. Paper prepared for the National Governors' Association Conference on School Delivery Standards, Washington, DC, August 27-28, 1992.

Porter, A. C. (1993a). School delivery standards. *Educational Researcher, 22*(5), 24-30.

Porter, A. C. (1993b). *Defining and measuring opportunity to learn*. Paper prepared for the National Governors' Association.

Porter, A. C., Archbald, D. A., & Tyree, A. K., Jr. (1991). Reforming the curriculum: Will empowerment policies replace control? In S. Fuhrman and B. Malen (Eds.), *The politics of curriculum and testing: The 1990 yearbook of the Politics of Education Association* (pp. 11-36). Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Porter, A. C., & Brophy, J. (1988). Synthesis of research on good teaching: Insights from the work of the Institute for Research on Teaching. *Educational Leadership, 45*(8), 74-85.

Porter, A. C., Kirst,t M., Osthoff, E., & Smithson, J. (1993). *Reform Up Close: A classroom analysis* (Final report to the National Science Foundation, Grant No. SPA-8953446). Madison: Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

Porter, A. C., Smithson, J., & Osthoff, E. (in press). Standard setting as a strategy for upgrading high school mathematics and science. In S. Fuhrman & R. Elmore (Eds.), *Governing curriculum*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Raths, J., & Fanning, J. (1993). *Primary reform in Kentucky revisited*. Lexington, KY: The Pritchard Committee for Academic Excellence.

Ravitch, D. (1993). Launching a revolution in standards and assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan, 74*, 767-772.

Rivlin, A. M., & Timpane, M. P. (Eds.). (1975). *Planned variation in education: Should we give up or try harder?* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Roeder, P. W. (1993). *Assessment of family resource and youth services centers*. Lexington, KY: The Pritchard Committee for Academic Excellence.

Rutherford, F. J., & Ahlgren, A. (1990). *Science for all Americans*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Salganik, L. H. (1981). The fall and rise of education vouchers. *Education Digest, 47*(4), 6-10.

Sautter, R. C. (1993). *Charter schools: A new breed of public schools*. Oak Brook, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.

Sizer, T. R. (1992). *Horace's school: Redesigning the American high school*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Karweit, N. L., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (1992). *Success for all: A relentless approach to prevention and early intervention in elementary schools*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Smith, M. S., & O'Day, J. (1991). Systemic school reform. In S. H. Fuhrman & B. Malen (Eds.), *The politics of curriculum and testing: The 1990 yearbook of the Politics of Education Association*. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

U.S. Department of Education. (1991). *America 2000: An education strategy*. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education. (1993). *Schools and staffing in the United States: Selected data for public and private schools, 1990-91*. Washington, DC: Author.